

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID C. THACKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

AT&T CORPORATION, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:20-cv-00255-KJM-CKD PS

ORDER

(ECF No. 22)

Presently before the court is plaintiff's "motion for additional discovery." (ECF No. 22.) Defendant AT&T Corporation has filed a response to plaintiff's motion. (ECF No. 23.) Although not entirely clear, it appears that plaintiff is requesting the court to permit him to serve 25 interrogatories, in addition to the 25 interrogatories he has already served, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(a)(1). Plaintiff is also seeking to serve additional requests for admission and requests for production of documents. Plaintiff has not provided defendant with these requests or interrogatories. Defendant opposes plaintiff's motion as it lacks sufficient information to determine whether the requests are within the proper scope of discovery. (ECF No. 23.)

Local Rule 251 requires parties to meet and confer regarding any discovery disagreement, including motions to exceed discovery limitations, and requires parties to prepare a joint statement regarding the dispute. L.R. 251(b). If a joint statement is not filed at least seven days

1 before the scheduled hearing, the hearing may be dropped from the calendar without prejudice.

2 Here, the parties have not filed the requisite joint statement within the allotted time.

3 Accordingly, the court DENIES plaintiff's "motion for additional discovery" (ECF No. 22)
4 without prejudice and VACATES the hearing scheduled for September 16, 2020. Plaintiff is
5 advised to follow Local Rule 251 for any additional discovery disputes in this matter.

6 Dated: September 10, 2020



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10 16.255.do